4.1 Introduction

The abundance of place names in the oracles of Zech 9:1–8 has attracted great attention from biblical scholars. In examining the toponyms mentioned in these eight verses, many have attempted to relate them to historical manoeuvres, generating a wide diversity of interpretation. Masing argued that the oracles should refer to the second campaign of Tiglath-Pileser in 734–32 B.C. while Otzen thought that they were in the reign of Josiah.\(^1\) Stade believed that it refers to the conquest of Alexander in 332 B.C. while Sellin opted for the Maccabean period, ca. 150–40 B.C., in which Tyre and Sidon were in opposition to Judas Maccabeaus.\(^2\) Hanson comments: “each of these solutions can be argued as persuasively as the others…since none of those conquests matches the text perfectly.”\(^3\) Rudolph adds: “Denn in der Richtung von Norden nach Süden müßte Hamath vor Damaskus und Sidon vor Tyrus stehen.”\(^4\) In addition, we notice that the conqueror in the text is God and not Alexander or any human beings.

---

\(^1\) For the work of Masing, see Masing,”Die Proklamation Des Tab’ Alsohnes,” 73–98. For the work of Otzen, see Otzen, \textit{Studien über Deuterosacharja}.

\(^2\) For the work of Stade, see Stade, “Deuterosacharja,” 1–96, 151–72 and 275–309. For the work of Sellin, see Sellin, \textit{Das Zwölffprophetenbuch}.

\(^3\) Hanson, \textit{Dawn of Apocalyptic}, 290.

Dissatisfied with the divergent results, recent scholars tend to relate Zech 9:1–8 with the Davidic traditions, claiming that the significance of these cities is that they were the traditional enemies of the old Davidic kingdom.\(^5\) Redditt contends that “Zechariah 9–14 opened with a chapter…depicting God’s recapturing the old Davidic empire (9:1–8)”\(^6\) whereas Petterson asserts that “The message of the oracle is…that Yahweh is coming to re-establish the kingdom promised to David.”\(^7\) We admit that the re-use of earlier traditions is a notable phenomenon in Second Zechariah and this line of enquiry can yield a better result than a historical-critical approach.\(^8\) However, not all the toponyms mentioned in the schema were once traditional enemies of Israel, such as Hadrach and Hamath; nor all of them had been included within the Davidic kingdom, such as Sidon and Tyre. Moreover, when Zech 9:1–8 was composed, all these regions, together with Israel, were under the Persian rule, posing no threat to post-exilic Yehud. If the text alluded to the greatest extent of the Davidic empire, or even a kingdom surpassing that of David, as Hanson argues,\(^9\) we would expect the land east of the Jordan to be mentioned, as Kaufmann states.\(^10\)

---

\(^5\) Such as Hobbs, “Language of Warfare,” 121; Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 170; Nogalski, Redactional Processes, 219; Curtis, Up the Steep and Stony Road, 169; Petterson, Behold Your King, 131. Cf. Boda states: “[these cities] continue as symbols of the early enemies of Israel, who threaten the realization of the promise of land to Israel”; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 413.

\(^6\) Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 102.

\(^7\) Petterson, Behold Your King, 135.

\(^8\) See “Chapter Two: Methodological Consideration.”


\(^10\) The work of Kaufmann reminds us that “in the Bible we find five different conceptions of the Land of Israel
If the depiction of the campaign neither matches any specific conquest of the past, nor does the passage allude to any Davidic traditions, then this raises the question of why the redactor composed this schema of toponyms at the beginning of the corpus. We contend that the significance of the place names and the military activities in this section can be understood in light of the intertexts of the passage. Based on this, the following will offer an intertextual analysis of Zech 9:1–8, investigating to what biblical materials the text alludes and what impact such intertextual insights might make upon the prophetic community. For the sake of discussion, we divide Zech 9:1–8 into three sections: (1) the maššā' of Yahweh (Zech 9:1a); (2) the territorial claim of Yahweh (Zech 9:1b–7); and (3) the inauguration of the new age (Zech 9:8).

4.2 The maššā' of Yahweh (Zech 9:1a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:1a¹¹</th>
<th>שָׂ֣מַשָּׂ֤א 1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a A maššā’.</td>
<td>שָׂ֣מַש 1a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Zechariah opens with a word שָׂמַש, which also appears in Zech 12:1, functioning both as a title and an introduction to the subsequent oracle, namely, Zech 9–11, and serving as the

---

¹¹ All English translations of Second Zechariah are mine and the English translations of other biblical texts are from NASB95, unless noted otherwise. When the MT numeration does not match with the NASB95 numeration, the former will be used with the latter given in square parentheses, unless noted otherwise.
reading key of the corpus. The *mahēppakh* under the ז might indicate a construct chain: “The maşšā’ of the word of Yahweh.”\(^\text{12}\) Hanson adopts this rendering with a second רכזח added before ז in order to adjust the metric structure in 9:1: “The oracle of Yahweh’s word: Yahweh is against Hadrach.”\(^\text{13}\) However, such an emendation does not have any support in the versions.\(^\text{14}\)

Without a second רכזח, the understanding of רכזח אֶפְשָׁא as a construct chain becomes less compelling.\(^\text{15}\) In view of this, we opt for an appositional relationship rather than a possessive one: “A maşšā’. The word of the Lord is against the land of Hadrach,” with אֶפְשָׁא as an overall heading for Zech 9–11 and רכזח אֶפְשָׁא as a specific word-event for Zech 9:1–8.\(^\text{16}\)

The construction רכזח אֶפְשָׁא אֶפְשָׁא occurs exclusively in Zech 9:1; 12:1; and Mal 1:1. Based on this, Nogalski argues that “the similarity of the superscriptions in Zech 9:1; 12:1; and Mal 1:1 point toward a deliberate shaping on the part of a redactor.”\(^\text{17}\) However the uses of the formulation in the three places are quite different. In Zech 9:1, only the word אֶפְשָׁא serves as a superscription with the rest of the verse forming part of a poetic oracle.\(^\text{18}\) By contrast, both the

\(^{12}\) Larkin, *Eschatology*, 54. Cf. NAU, NKJ.  
\(^{13}\) Hanson believes that the second רכזח is lost due to haplography; Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 294–96.  
\(^{17}\) Nogalski, *Redactional Processes*, 217.  
\(^{18}\) Contra Kashow who argues that both Zech 9 and 12 begin their oracles with the particle רכזח (see table below); Kashow, “Canonical Function,” unpublished.
first half of Zech 12:1 (מענף בברית ישראל) and the whole of Mal 1:1 (ברית יי וברית ישראל) function as titles of the corpora, with בברית ישראל denoting Israel as the subject of the oracle in the former one (cf. Zeph 2:5; Mic 1:1) and בברית יי implying Israel as the recipient of Yahweh’s word in the latter one (cf. Hag 1:1). In view of this, Zech 9:1 might not have a literary dependence with Mal 1:1.  

The lexeme א費 occurs 67 times in the Hebrew Bible, with 4 occasions referring to names of persons or regions (such as Gen 25:14), 35 times denoting the bearing of weighty objects or heavy responsibilities (such as Exod 23:5; Num 11:11), and 28 occasions depicting prophetic speech or writing. Prior to the 1980’s, the definition of א費 as a reference to prophetic speech was largely dominated by etymological investigation. Most scholars have argued that the meaning of the word should be derived from the well-established sense of the lexeme א費, referring to something that is literally or figuratively burdensome, thus describing either a prophecy of doom or the hard responsibility of the prophet. However, a review of the various

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition + addressee</th>
<th>Elaboration about</th>
<th>Oracle begins with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מַעֲנֶף בְּבַרְיָתָהּ</td>
<td>(i) יְהוָה (ii) addressee</td>
<td>(9:4) יְהוָה אֶחָד</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
prophetic passages in which the word אָמַר appears establishes the fact that this word does not always introduce an ominous prophecy (such as Jer 23:38). Hence, using etymology to understand a word is not always helpful for understanding the meaning of it at a specific time.\footnote{Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 340.}

In his doctoral work, Weis leveraged form-critical categories and presented a full definition of אָמַר as a genre which is a form-critical tag used in the prophetic speech or text with “the intention to expound, on the basis of a particular revelation, the way YHWH’s action/intention will be manifested in human affairs—this to give instruction for the present or insight into the future.”\footnote{Weis, “Genre Maśšā’,” abstract.} This innovative view of אָמַר has been applied and developed by subsequent scholars, such as Floyd, Sweeney, and Woodcock.\footnote{Floyd, \textit{Minor Prophets 2}, 306; Floyd, “אָמַר (Maśšā’),” 401–22; Sweeney, \textit{Twelve Prophets 2}, 656–57; Woodcock, “Forms and Functions,” 1–5.} However, the weakness of Weis’ thesis is that there are exceptions to patterns that he has highlighted for those אָמַר texts.\footnote{See the exceptions in Weis’ work; Weis, “Genre Maśšā’,” 212-13.} The deviations may signal to Weis that he is not dealing with a unique form.\footnote{Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 349.} In addition, one may argue that a number of prophetic speech forms also express Yahweh’s intention, such as woe oracles and lawsuits, conveying God’s impending judgment. After reviewing all the אָמַר texts, we conclude that this word can only be regarded as a general tag denoting prophetic revelation.\footnote{Oswalt, \textit{Isaiah: Chapters 1–39}, 296.} Thus we prefer to understand אָמַר within its immediate context rather than as an overarching generic category.
The use of the word מַלְאָךְ alone as a title in Zech 9:1 is unique among those 28 occurrences depicting prophetic speech. Is there any significance to this opening מַלְאָךְ besides introducing the subsequent revelation? Boda suggests that the importance of מַלְאָךְ can be discerned through a closer look at the traditio-historical relationship between the book of Jeremiah and Second Zechariah. He claims that of all the tradition streams that have influenced Zech 9–14, the Jeremianic one is clearly the strongest. When we scrutinize the book of Jeremiah, we discover that the greatest concentration of the term מַלְאָךְ as a reference to prophetic speech in the Hebrew Bible occurs in Jer 23:33–40, a passage within a larger literary context denouncing false prophets (Jer 23:9–40). When condemning the false prophets, Jer 23:9–40 gives a comprehensive explication of the word of Yahweh, particularly in v. 29, where the word of the Lord is a powerful weapon, like fire that burns straw or like a hammer that shatters rocks. This connotation of the word of Yahweh suits well the nuance of the phrase מַלְאָךְ used in Zech 9:1b when the subsequent כְּ is translated with adversative sense. Since other part of Jer 23 (vv.1–4, 7–8) is also alluded to in Zech 10, we suggest that the מַלְאָךְ in Zech 9:1 may have been influenced by Jer 23:33–40 though a literary dependence is probably not the case due to lack of convincing

---


29 Tai suggests that the phrase מַלְאָךְ רָאִים in Zech 9:1; 12:1; and Mal 1:1 should be understood with Jer 23:28–40 in mind; Tai, Prophetic als Schriftauslegung, 13.

30 See discussion below.

31 See “7.3 Yahweh as the Source of Leadership” and “….ch. 8.”
verbal parallel. A close investigation of the source text might shed light on our understanding of the term אָבָנ here.

Jeremiah 23:33–40 is embedded within a larger context which criticizes false prophets (23:9–40). The pericope (23:9–40) is headed with a superscription: וַיְאָבֹנֵי, with the root אָבָנ or אָבָנ occurring twenty-three times within it. The whole unit can be divided into six sections: (1) The first section (23:9–12) opens with Jeremiah’s heartbroken lament (v. 9), triggered by the strong judgment against prophet and priest who committed evils even in Yahweh’s house (vv. 10–12); (2) The second section (23:13–15) is another accusation directed against the prophets, especially those of Jerusalem, who have done even worse than the prophets of Samaria (vv. 14–15); (3) The third section (23:16–22) is a clear attack on the false prophets who spoke peace out of their own mind rather than from Yahweh, leading to the demise of Judah; (4) The fourth section (23:23–24) contains three rhetorical questions which serve as the basis for judgment against the false prophets whose wickedness cannot be hidden and whose punishment cannot be escaped from this unavoidable God; (5) The fifth section (23:25–32) accuses the ones who prophesy false dreams which make the people forget Yahweh; and (6) The last section (23:33–40)
appears to be a play on the word אָפֶּן. It begins with a question-and-answer schema—whenever people ask for יהוה אפֶּן, tell them that there is no more אפֶּן from Yahweh for the Lord abandons them (v. 33). Thus if anyone presumes to have a genuine יהוה אפֶּן, that person will be punished for giving false revelation (v. 34; cf. vv. 38–40). The people are forbidden to use the phrase יהוה אפֶּן as they have perverted Yahweh’s words by perceiving their own words as יהוה אפֶּן (v. 36).

Petersen contends that Jer 23:34–40 is a “deutero-prophetic” text, an exegetical piece with יהוה אפֶּן inserted later to “prohibit new oracles in the classical prophetic style” (23:34). He links the expansion of these verses to the same period as Zech 13:2–6, both rejecting prophecy as a means of new revelation. However, the curtailing of the prophetic process is not unusual in the earlier Jeremianic tradition, such as 14:1–15:4, where the prophet is told not to intercede for the

---

37 Boda and Porter argue: “this section describes a crisis over the use of massā’ among false prophets, prophets who claimed to have the dê bar YHWH when they were only speaking their own words”; Boda, and Porter, “Literature to the Third Degree,” 230. For the different interpretations of Jer 23:36, see Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 651–52; McKane, W. “faith,” 35–54.
38 Petersen, Late Israelite Prophecy, 33.
39 Petersen argues that Zech 13:2–6 reflects the rejection of prophecy as a means of new revelation, similar to Jer 23:33–40; Petersen, Late Israelite Prophecy, 33–38. However, we argue that Zech 13:2–6 deals with false prophecy rather than rejection of prophecy, with 13:2–3 condemning specifically the idolatry prophets and 13:4–6 rebuking generally the deceptive prophets; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 490–94. Carroll and Fretheim echo Petersen’s conclusion, but with additional concern. Carroll comments that the argument of relating Jer 23:34–40 to the period similar to Zech 13:2–6 “is quite likely, though not capable of demonstrable proof”; Carroll, Jeremiah, 480. Fretheim claims that “most likely” Jer 23:33–40 “is concerned to make claims for the prophecy of Jeremiah … especially with respect to its burdensome message of ‘gloom and doom,’ in the face of critical voices”; Fretheim, Jeremiah, 340. However, Jones argues that Jer 23:33–40 “must be the work of either Jeremiah himself or a prophet in the tradition”; Jones, Jeremiah, 315.
people.\textsuperscript{40} If we read 23:34–40 within its larger literary context, we realize that the concern of the passage is not over the means of prophecy, contra Petersen, but rather over the source of prophecy—from human minds or from the Lord (23:16; cf. 25, 28, 30). The problem in Jeremiah’s time is that the reckless lies of those false prophets led the people astray (23:32), forgetting the name of Yahweh as their forefathers did (23:27). Jeremiah 23:33–40 speaks to a particular crisis of false prophecy at the end of the southern kingdom leading to the judgment of Yahweh upon the disobedient generation.\textsuperscript{41} In Jer 23, the term Κριτής is only reserved for those authentic prophesies originated from Yahweh.

In the beginning of the corpus, Second Zechariah may intend to signal the reversal of the prohibition of Κριτής in Jer 23, indicating the “renewal of prophecy along the lines of earlier prophecy.”\textsuperscript{42} The use of this lexeme may establish authority for the oracular material being introduced, endorsing the role of the prophet as the legitimate mediator of Yahweh in a new era. The Κριτής, banned prior to the exile, was now available again in the midst of the prophetic community of Zech 9–14.

\textsuperscript{40} See “5.2 Yahweh is the Source of Supply.”
\textsuperscript{42} Boda, “Freeing the Burden,” 356.
4.3 The Territorial Claim of Yahweh (Zech 9:1b–7)

The opening of this pericope presents the audience with a number of enigmas. The lack of any verbs of motion in Zech 9:1b makes the translation difficult. Before we proceed, we have to determine the senses of ב and of הַשְׁמִימָנָה, which are interrelated. Some scholars claim that ב is probably locative, denoting that the word of Yahweh was heard in these foreign lands.\textsuperscript{43} However, the close parallel construction of Isa 9:7 with ב following רֹדֵב may argue for a hostile sense: “The Lord sends a message against Jacob (רֹדֵב אֲבָאֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל), and it falls on Israel,” though ב needs not carry any such a connotation in all cases, such as Hos 1:2.\textsuperscript{44}

The word הַשְׁמִימָנָה, assuming that the pronominal suffix connects to רֹדֵב, usually has a favorable sense in the Hebrew Bible, referring either the resting place of the chosen people, that is, the promised land (e.g. Deut 12:9), or the resting place of Yahweh, that is, the temple (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:56; Isa 66:1–2), thus supporting the locative connotation of ב.\textsuperscript{45} However, there is a striking parallel to the use of the root גָּנָה in Zech 6:8 in which Yahweh’s wrath finds rest when the northern country is subdued. In view of this correspondence, the word הַשְׁמִימָנָה may refer to the


\textsuperscript{44} Scholars supporting this view include, such as, Petterson, \textit{Behold Your King}, 130; Pierce, “Literary Connectors,” 282; Hanson, \textit{Dawn of Apocalyptic}, 294.

\textsuperscript{45} Such as Jones, “Fresh Interpretation,” 244; Tai, \textit{Prophetie als Schriftauslegung}, 13–14; Floyd, \textit{Minor Prophets} 2, 462. Similarly, Hanson opts for “throne dais” by comparing אֵלָּה with אֵל in the Ugaritic texts; Hanson, \textit{Dawn of Apocalyptic}, 297.
capture of Damascus, denoting that either God’s wrath is brought to rest or the city is included as part of the promised territory, namely, the resting place of the covenant community.\(^{46}\)

In Zech 9:1–8, the passage mostly adopts a hostile tone towards the nations with warlike image, particularly reflected in v. 8, where Yahweh encamps as a guard against any oppressor of his people.\(^{47}\) In light of this, we choose the second connotations for both cases which are more in line with the overall sense of the passage. Hence, we take יָנוּס as adversative: “against the land of” and nuance הָעֵצִים as the capture of Damascus. With this understanding of הָעֵצִים, the phrase יִשְׂרָאֵל in 9:1b could imply not only a word of judgment but also a word-event which leads to the downfall of the northern territories, though the divine attack is only mentioned explicitly from v. 4.

Based on the above assumption, the scene in Zech 9:1b–7 opens with the triumphant return of Yahweh, who marches down from north to south in the Levant, conquering some cities before reaching Jerusalem (v. 8). The areas being subdued can be divided into three groups: (1) the Syrian group (Zech 9:1b–2a); (2) the Phoenician group (Zech 9:2b–4); and (3) the Philistine group (Zech 9:5–7).\(^{48}\) In the following, we will analysis Zech 9:1b–7 according to the geographical locations of the places. As the present scholarly views on this passage generally link

\(^{47}\) See “4.3 The Enthronement of Yahweh.”
\(^{48}\) Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 162.
these toponyms to either the Davidic tradition or the promise land accounts, in our discussion below, a brief survey of each place, particularly relating to these traditions, will be sketched.

4.3.1 The Syrian Group (Zech 9:1b–2a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:1b–2a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1b The word of the Lord is against the land of Hadrach, and Damascus, his resting place,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c For Yahweh’s eye is on humankind, as well as on all the tribes of Israel.⁴⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a and also Hamath, which borders on it,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three Syrian areas, Hadrach, Damascus, and Hamath, are all inland territories which locate in the east of Phoenicia. Hadrach, which only appears here in the Hebrew Bible, is the northernmost of the geographic entities mentioned in the schema, with Hamath on its south. Since the northern border of the Israelite lands at their fullest was the entrance of Hamath, Hadrach lay beyond the greatest extent of the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom and was outside both

⁴⁹ The phrase in 9:1c is ambiguous, basically related to the translation of the construct chain גֵּין אָדָם וְכֹ֖ל שִׁבְטֵ֥י יִשְׂרָאֵֽל. Without resort to emendation, generally there are two major interpretations of the text. Some scholars opt for a subjective genitive: “For all humankind and all the tribes of Israel are looking towards Yahweh.” This translation focuses on the reaction of human being, denoting a sense of expectancy, waiting for Yahweh to take action, such as Webb, Message of Zechariah, 130. Others prefer an objective genitive with the preceding ב as possessive: “For Yahweh’s eye is on humankind, as well as on all the tribes of Israel,” such as Petersen, Prophetic Literature, 39–40. This translation, supported by the LXX, stresses the work of Yahweh, implying a sense that Yahweh as the universal Lord is watching over every aspect of humankind, including his people, to whom God is going to visit. We choose the latter interpretation due to a similar universalistic overtone highlighting Yahweh’s global dominion is also found in Zech 12:1. Reading within context, the elaboration in the second קָרָא serves to remind the readers to pay great attention to the coming cosmos-wide transformation of Yahweh, both for Israel and the nations. Another reason for choosing the latter interpretation is that its nuanced view matches the God’s eye-keeping watch motif at the end of this unit: בָּמַע (9:8b), with Yahweh’s קֵנ bracketing the whole section (9:1–8). The transcendent character of Yahweh emphasized here also finds its echo in the first vision in Zech 1:7–17 where Yahweh has sent his hosts to patrol the earth. Scholars, such as Rudolph, have emended conjecturally to read אָרֶם (Aram) instead of אָדָם (Adam); Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 167–68. For various emendation of Zech 9:1c, see discussion in Mason’s work; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 11–12.
the historical and ideal borders of the Israelite kingdom (Num 34:7–8; cf. Ezek 47:17).

Information about Hadrach is scarce. It can be a city or a district. Since it appears together with הָרָא, most likely it represents an area rather than a city. Its function here probably denotes that the divine warrior, Yahweh, is coming from the far north.

Damascus appears 43 times in the Hebrew Bible. Being the capital of Aram during the 10th through 8th centuries B.C., it is well-known as a commercial centre in antiquity. The city had been a rival to Israel since the time of the Israelite settlement, constantly posing grave dangers to the territorial integrity of the tribal portions. Though it was not included in the ideal boundary of Israel (Num 34:1–12), it was once subdued and incorporated into the empire of David (2 Sam 8:5–6). Afterwards, it was lost under Solomon’s reign when Rezon captured it and proclaimed himself king (1 Kgs 11:23–25). Damascus continued to pose a threat to the northern borders of Israel throughout the monarchy until the reign of Jeroboam II who probably established it as a vassal of Israel (2 Kgs 14:25, 28). Damascus was defeated by Tiglath-Pileser III in 732 B.C., came under Babylonian domination in 604 B.C., and was a provincial capital under Persian

---

50 Hadrach appears in the inscription of Zakkur (ca. 800 B.C.), depicting the miraculous deliverance of Zakkur and his capital Hadrach from a siege by a coalition of kingdoms headed by Bar-Hadad, son of Hazael; Parker, *Stories in Scripture and Inscriptions*, 106–10, 134. Based on Neo-Assyrian texts, some scholars, such as Na'aman, relate Hadrach to Hatarikka, a Syrian region having been conquered by Tiglath-pileser in 738 B.C.; Na'aman, Ancient Israel and Its Neighbors I, 147–49.

51 The noun כפם appears 43 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 14:15; 15:2; 2 Sam 8:5, 6; 1 Kgs 11:24 (x2); 15:18; 19:15; 20:34; 2 Kgs 5:12; 8:7, 9; 14:28; 16:9, 10 (x2), 11 (x2), 12; 2 Chr 16:2; 24:23; 28:5, 23; Song 7:5; Isa 7:8 (x2); 8:4; 10:9; 17:1 (x2), 3; Jer 49:23, 24, 27; Ezek 27:18; 47:16, 17, 18; 48:1; Amos 1:3, 5; 5:27; Zech 9:1.
rule. In the prophetic literature, oracles against Damascus occur in only in Isa 17:1–3; Jer 49:23–27; and Amos 1:3–5.

Hamath occurs 36 times in the Hebrew Bible. It is a place bordering on Israel, with the phrase בֹּא חֲמָת (entrance of Hamath) being typically used in the Bible to denote a site on the northern boundary of the ideal territory (Num 34:7–8; Ezek 47:16–17, 20). It seems that Hamath was in good relationship with Israel during David’s reign (2 Sam 8:9–11) and was under Israelite control during Solomon’s rule (2 Chr 8:4). The city might have gained independence as Jeroboam II is said to have recovered Damascus and Hamath for Israel (2 Kgs 14:28). Hamath eventually threw off this control and reached its greatest power in the 8th century B.C. However, by 720 B.C., it was incorporated into the Assyrian empire. The Assyrian ravages were so serious that most of the city was abandoned with few settlements only during the Persian period. In the prophetic literature, there is no oracle against Hamath.

Because of the common appearance of רַפְסִּים and אֵפֹּם, Larkin suggests that Zech 9:1 contains a piece of mantological exegesis, alluding to Isa 17:1, 7: “The oracle concerning Damascus (רַפְסִּים אֵפֹּם). ‘Behold, Damascus is about to be removed from being a city and will become a fallen ruin…. In that day man (נָּצָר) will have regard for his Maker and his eyes (יָבָע)
will look to the Holy One of Israel (‘םיהוה’).” The Isaianic oracle (17:1–8) laments the destruction of Damascus (vv. 1–3) as well as Ephraim (vv. 4–6), events associated with the Syro-Ephraimite assault on Judah in 735–32 B.C. In verse 7–8, a proper attitude of the people will be developed after the catastrophic judgment—they will look for their Maker and turn away from idols. The thrust of Larkin’s proposal ties to the interpretation of Zech 9:1c, that is, “the writer describes a day on which all eyes are turned to the Lord, and all the tribes of Israel (including the lost Ephraim) are restored together with Damascus.” Another ground of her argument is based on the assumption that the Zecharian author has invested Damascus with mantological significance for the future of Israel, she contends: “I suggest that this yoking together of the fate of Ephraim with that of Damascus could have been troubling to a post-exilic writer such as Zechariah who was deeply concerned with the restoration of ‘the glory of the children of Israel’ (and specifically of Ephraim in 9:13 and 10:6–12…), and could have prompted him to undertake an important piece of mantological exegesis.” However, we are reluctant to register this connection for the following reasons: (1) we do not agree with Larkin’s interpretation of Zech 9:1c (see above); and (2) we cannot find evidence in Zech 9:1–8 indicating how Damascus is so outstanding from other toponyms as she asserts.

55 Larkin, Eschatology, 57.
57 Larkin, Eschatology, 59.
With the demise of Damascus, Sweeney contends that Zech 9:1–2a represents the itinerary of the Assyrian monarch who defeated Damascus at the time of the Syro-Ephraimitic War (Isa 17:1–3). The argument seems to be weak as the Isaianic text is a prophecy of doom concerning Damascus rather than an account of its invasion in 732–35 B.C. In addition, Hamath is listed third in the schema though it actually lies between Hadrach and Damascus, with the former on the north and the latter on the south. If the list is viewed as the route of a military campaign, the itinerary may seem irregular. However, if we understand the schema as concerning the boundaries of the promised land envisioned by Ezekiel, then the existing sequence of places causes no difficulty, with Damascus relating to the eastern border and Hamath defining the northern extent of the tribal allotments (Ezek 47:17–18). Zechariah 9:1b–2a depends heavily on Ezek 47:13–20, with הָעֵבָדִים, הָעָבָד, הָעָבַד, הָעָבַד, הָעָבַד, and הָעָבַד as catchwords:

**Ezekiel 47:13–20**

13 Thus says the Lord GOD, “This shall be the boundary (זָבַד) by which you shall divide the land for an inheritance among the twelve tribes of Israel (שֵׁבֶט), Joseph shall have two portions.

14 “You shall divide it for an inheritance, each one equally with the other; for I swore to give it to your forefathers, and this land shall fall to you as an inheritance.

15 “This shall be the boundary (זָבַד) of the land: on the north side, from the Great Sea by the way of Hethlon, to the entrance of Zedad;

16 Hamath (חַם), Berothah, Sibraim, which is between the border (זָבַד) of Damascus (דָּמָשֶׁק) and the border (זָבַד) of Hamath (חַם); Hazer-hatticon, which is by the border (זָבַד) of Hauran.

---

59 Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets 2*, 661.

17 “The boundary (בָּחוֹן) shall extend from the sea to Hazar-enan at the border (בָּחוֹן) of Damascus (דָּמָשֶׁק), and on the north toward the north is the border (בָּחוֹן) of Hamath (חַם). This is the north side.

18 “The east side, from between Hauran, Damascus (דָּמָשֶׁק), Gilead and the land of Israel, shall be the Jordan; from the north border (בָּחוֹן) to the eastern sea you shall measure. This is the east side.

19 “The south side toward the south shall extend from Tamar as far as the waters of Meribath-kadesh, to the brook of Egypt and to the Great Sea. This is the south side toward the south.

20 “The west side shall be the Great Sea, from the south border (בָּחוֹן) to a point opposite Lebo-hamath (לָבֹה). This is the west side.

The phrase המַשֵּׁם הַשָּׁדָּא appears 47 times in the Hebrew Bible. As a “territorial and political entity” arising in earliest Israel, the term המַשֵּׁם did not fare well under the monarchy and became meaningless after the fall of the united kingdom. The Babylonian conquest further shattered “whatever modicum of reality may have been retained in the concept of a confederation of tribes.” Though the term המַשֵּׁם appears with decreasing frequency, particularly in the later biblical texts, it never disappears. In the Persian period, it takes on new meaning, especially in construct with יהוה, “to represent the ideal of the people restored in their land.” This notion of יהוה occurs notably in the vision of the restored land in Ezek 47–48 (Ezek 47:13, 21, 22; 48:19, 29, 31). The city יְשָׁרֵי is not mentioned in the tribal allotment in Num 34:1–12 but named three times in the ideal boundary in Ezek 47:13–20. The place יְשָׁרֵי is stated once in the former

---


territory allocation (Num 34:8) while four times in the latter one (Ezek 47:16–17, 20). The direct lexical link between the two texts is strong. In addition, both the boundaries in Zechariah and Ezekiel are represented from north to south. Based on these similarities, we register Ezek 47:13–20 as an intertext of Zech 9:1b–2a.  

**Allusion to Ezek 47:13–20.** The great temple vision (Ezek 40–48) ends with a theological geography, whose thrust is the divine presence (chs 47–48). The description of the ideal boundaries (47:13–20) is an introduction to the tribal allotment of the land (48:1–29), with vv. 21–23 concerning the inheritance for the resident aliens, an unprecedented concept going far beyond the Torah’s legislation (cf. Exod 23:9; Lev 19:10, 33–34; Deut 24:17–22). At the heart of the new commonwealth stands the temple which is the source of blessing for the land (47:1–12). Each tribe could enjoy equal stake in the new city where Yahweh is present within (48:30–35). Verse 14 lays down a premise that the division of the land is a divine fulfillment of the land promised to the forefathers. However, in order to realize this promise, three conditions must be ready: (1) the land to be inherited (cf. 47:13–20); (2) the acceptance of the aliens (cf. 47:21–23); and (3) the existence of the twelve tribes (cf. 48:1–29).

---

63 Tai has noted this connection, too; Tai, *Prophetie als Schriftauslegung*, 21.
By leveraging earlier materials, the advent of the divine warrior Yahweh presents a vision in which the deity inaugurates the claim of the promised land, thus satisfying the first condition. With this picture of the restored ideal land, Meyers claims that these eight verses aim at “restoring the historic homeland” of Israel.\(^{65}\) Though the restoration of the ideal homeland does form one of the major motifs of Zech 9:1–8, we would query why the text about the promised land in Ezekiel rather than Numbers is alluded to.\(^{66}\) Stevenson argues that the intention to define boundaries in Ezek 47 is to establish territories, asserting Yahweh’s territorial claim as the divine king of Israel. Yahweh is the only power holder and all others are power subjects in his territories.\(^{67}\) She argues that the notion of divine kingship in Ezek 40–48 is apparent when the glory of Yahweh returns to the temple (יִבְיָהוֹ; 43:4–5) where the Lord delivers his very first statement: “Son of man, this is the place of My throne and the place of the soles of My feet” (43:7a).\(^{68}\) Thus, the primary purpose of the advent of Yahweh is not just to build a commonwealth in its own land, but to create a temple society with Yahweh in its midst as king.

The Ezekielian text stresses that the divine presence is the source of blessing for the new יְהוּדָה.

---

\(^{65}\) Meyers, “Foreign Places.” 165.

\(^{66}\) The argument that Zech 9:1b–2a alludes to Ezek 47 rather than Num 34 is based on the fact that the boundaries in Zechariah and Ezekiel are represented from north to south whereas the borders in Numbers are described from south to north. In addition, the city בָּבֶר is not mentioned in the tribal allotment in Num 34:1–12 but named three times in the ideal boundary in Ezek 47:13–20. Contra Schellenberg who argues that these toponyms are “within the ideal borders of the Promised Land (Numbers 34)”; Schellenberg, “One in the Bond of War,” 106.

\(^{67}\) Stevenson points out that the lack of vertical dimensions in Ezek 40–48 indicates that the text is not a “temple blueprint” as many scholars argue, such as, Patton, “Ezekiel’s Blueprint for the Temple of Jerusalem.” She contends that the corpus represents a vision of a temple society organized according to a new set of spatial rules, based on a spatial theology of holiness; Stevenson, Vision of Transformation, 4–7, 163.

\(^{68}\) Stevenson, Vision of Transformation, 50–51. Cf. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 509–16; Blenkinsopp, Ezekiel, 211.
With these intertextual insights, the significance of the schema is that it portrays the territorial claim of Yahweh rather than his military campaign. The geography of the toponyms is important not only in circumscribing the ideal homeland but also in envisioning the restored Israel—a new people who will enjoy Yahweh’s presence, a new people who will acknowledge Yahweh’s kingship.

The Syrian group passage envisages the fulfilment of the promise of the ideal homeland by Yahweh. In the Ezekielian text, the description of the boundaries is followed by the division of the land. By staying at the stage of circumscribing the land, the text endows the readers with an expectation and creates for them a vision—the inheritance of the land.

### 4.3.2 The Phoenician Group (Zech 9:2b–4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:2b–4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2b</strong> Tyre and Sidon, though she was very wise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3a</strong> For Tyre built for herself a rampart,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3b</strong> and piled up silver as dust, and gold as mud of streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a</strong> Look! The Lord will dispossess her, and throw her wealth in the sea,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b</strong> and she will be devoured by the fire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the Syrian group, the Phoenician territory, represented by Sidon and Tyre, plays a different role in the biblical conception of the Israelite boundaries, in which Sidon

---

Tyre\textsuperscript{70} are not mentioned in any text of the promised land (Num 34:1–12; Ezek 47:15–20) but included in “the land that remains” (Josh 13:4–6). The tribal allotment of Asher is associated with Great Sidon and Old Tyre, though the extent of Asher’s actual control of these lands is questionable (Josh 19:27–29; Cf. Judg 1:31–32).\textsuperscript{71} Even in the period of Davidic-Solomonic expansion, the Phoenician coast remained external to Israelite domination. Solomon’s transfer of the twenty Galilean cities in Asher to Hiram definitely affects the territorial integrity of Israel (1 Kgs 9:11).\textsuperscript{72} The expectations of territorial restoration not only include Tyre and Sidon which are considered part of Israelite allotment but also all of Phoenicia which was included in Ezekiel’s prophecies—the western boundary is given as the Mediterranean coast as far north as a point “opposite Lebo-Hamath” (noon, לְבוֹ-הָמַת; Ezek 47:20).

Although two Phoenician cities are mentioned, only the description of Tyre is elaborated upon (Zech 9:2b–4). We do not have much information about the relationship between Sidon and Israel besides some in the reign of Ahab.\textsuperscript{73} In the biblical account, Sidon and Tyre are generally paired, rebuked with similar sinful deeds (cf. Jer 47:4; Joel 4:4 [3:4]). In the Persian

\textsuperscript{70} The place name רְאוֹנָה appears 43 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 19:29; 2 Sam 5:11; 24:7; 1 Kgs 5:15; 7:13; 9:11, 12; 1 Chr 14:1; 2 Chr 2:2, 10; Ps 45:13; 83:8; 87:4; 89:44; Isa 23:1, 5, 8, 15 (x2), 17; Jer 25:22; 27:3; 47:4; Ezek 26:2, 3, 4, 7, 15; 27:2, 3 (x2), 8, 32; 28:2, 12; 29:18 (x2); Hos 9:13; Joel 4:4; Amos 1:9, 10; Zech 9:2, 3.

\textsuperscript{71} The term מִבְצַרְצָר (the fortified city of Tyre) in Josh 19:29 refers to Old Tyre on the mainland opposite the island Tyre; Katzenstein, History of Tyre, 65.

\textsuperscript{72} This transfer seems to be improbable by the Chronicler, thus reversing the action (2 Chr 8:2). See the discussion in Japhet, I & II Chronicles, 621.

\textsuperscript{73} In 1 Kgs 16:31, there is an “Ethbaal king of Sidonians” who was the father of Jezebel, the wife of Ahab. From the work of Josephus, Against Apion, we know that Ethbaal is the king of Tyre whose reign marks the second golden age of the city. At that time, Tyre and Sidon became a political unit until 701 B.C.; Josephus, et al., New Complete Works of Josephus, 319. Cf. Edwards, “Tyre,” 688.
period, Sidon became an important administrative centre of the empire, with status surpassing that of Tyre. On the other hand, Tyre is mentioned much more in the Hebrew Bible, especially in the Deuteronomic history. As a trade port lying in the heart of the seas, the city was famous for its great wealth, remarkable wisdom, and impregnable stronghold (Ezek 27:3; 28:3–5). Tyre was never stated as an enemy threatening Israel but rather as an economic alliance of the Israelite kingdom. In fact, the king of Tyre gave numerous assistance and materials for more than twenty years in the great building project of Davidic-Solomonic era (2 Sam 5:11; 1 Kgs 5:16–27; 9:10).

After being besieged by Nebuchadnezzar for 13 years (ca. 585–572 B.C.), Tyre’s power was totally exhausted. Later, it became part of the Persian empire, as a “powerful polity in the Levant, second only to Sidon.”

There are three awkward elements in Zech 9:2b–4: (1) Tyre is mentioned first although Sidon was more important in the Persian empire, and this results in a disrupted itinerary (Zech

---

74 Eiselen states: “The statements of ancient classical writers make it plain that during this entire [Persian] period Sidon stood out as the most prominent city of Phoenicia…The Persian kings selected Sidon as their temporary residence, whenever their duties called them westward…In the war against the Greeks the eighty vessels of the Phoenicians were under the command of the king of the Sidonians, and in battle the Sidonians were the bravest and most courageous fighters in the Persian fleet”; Eiselen, *Sidon*, 61. Jigoulov supports this idea: “…by the time of Xerxes, the city of Sidon had emerged as the central and most powerful player on the Levantine coast in economic, political and maritime matters. Its citizens supplied manpower to many military operations of the Persians, for anything from quelling the Ionian revolt of 499 BCE to the operations against pro-Athenian Cypriot towns. Sidon remained as a satrapal capital city at least until the middle of the fourth century BCE”; Jigoulov, *Achaemenid Phoenicia*, 141; cf. Jigoulov, *Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia*, 166–67. Elayi claims that “Sidon was the leading Phoenician city in the Persian period”; Elayi, “Studies in Phoenician Geography,” 93–95; cf. Elayi, “Phoenician Cities,” 13–28. Katzenstein also supports this view: “…in the 6th century…Tyre lost preeminence to its twin city, Sidon”; Katzenstein, “Tyre,” 23. Cf. Schmitz, “Sidon (Place),” 17–18.

(2) a singular verb הָמָּכָּס with a plural subject נְדֶרֶשְׁנָא is used (Zech 9:2b); and (3) Tyre is singled out as Yahweh’s foe being punished harshly even though she was never a threat to the existence of Israel (Zech 9:3–4).

The mention of Tyre before Sidon in Zech 9:2b may suggest that tradition-historical considerations are preeminent over historical ones in the understanding of this passage. The prominent place of Tyre in the text could sharpen the focus of the readers, preparing them to seek the real concern of the schema from the tradition of Tyre.

The singular verb הָמָּכָּס with a plural subject נְדֶרֶשְׁנָא in Zech 9:2b has aroused a lot of discussions. BHS suggests נְדֶרֶשְׁנָא be emended to נְדֶרֶשְׁנָא whereas the LXX opts for a plural verb ἐφρόνησαν, retroverted as wmkx (they were wise). Similar to Otzen, Petersen argues that Tyre and Sidon serve as “a shorthand reference to the Phoenician coast,” thus a singular verb fitting well the approach. Though the uniform concept can be evidenced in the Hebrew Bible, the use of a singular verb with both cities as subject does not happen anywhere in the biblical books. Hanson proposes that we may perceive נְדֶרֶשְׁנָא as a secondary intrusion into Zech 9:2b for (1) נְדֶרֶשְׁנָא forms the heart of Zech 9:3, thus influencing the previous line; and (2) נְדֶרֶשְׁנָא are always mentioned together in the prophetic literature (e.g. Jer 47:4, Joel 4:4); and (3) נְדֶרֶשְׁנָא is especially famous for her
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76 Similar to the case of Hamath, see our discussion above.
77 Otzen argues that “das Wortpaar »Tyros und Sidon« wird als ein einheitlicher Begriff aufgefasst mit dem Verb im Singular”; Otzen, Studien über Deuteronomium, 237.
wisdom in Ezek 28:3–5, thus conflation resulted.\textsuperscript{79} Hence, from the text critical point of view, Hanson suggests that the best reading should be one that could reflect the announcement of judgment on Sidon in Zech 9:2b and on Tyre in Zech 9:3–4. However, contra to Hanson, Mason believes that Sidon should be secondary as she does not appear again in the text.\textsuperscript{80} Amid these conflicting hypotheses, we suggest to read the irregularity as an intertextual marker, prompting the audience to find meaning from another text.\textsuperscript{81} When the readers consider the subject of the clause (דַּיָּם הָמָּ֗מַק), the textual problem in Zech 9:2b functions to direct them to Ezek 26–28, the only other passage where Tyre is portrayed as a very wise city, with הָמָּ֗מַק appears in 27:8, 9; 28:3 and הָמָּ֗מַק occurs in 28:4, 5, 7, 12, 17.

The single out of Tyre as Yahweh’s foe in Zech 9:3–4 also serves as an intertextual clue, linking the audience to the earlier prophecies against the city. In the Hebrew Bible, oracles of judgement against Tyre are attested only in 4 occasions: Isa 23:1–14; Ezek 26:1–28:19; Amos 1:9–10 and Joel 4:4–8 [3:4–8]. Isaiah 23 summons to lament the demise of Tyre, a renowned commercial centre whose massive wealth and incredible power were once praised throughout the world. She was punished by Yahweh because of her pride and arrogance (23:9).\textsuperscript{82} The lengthy prophecy against Tyre in Ezekiel 26–28 asserts the fall of the strongly defended Tyre as she takes

\textsuperscript{79} Hanson, \textit{Dawn of Apocalyptic}, 298.
\textsuperscript{80} Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 17.
\textsuperscript{81} See “2.4 Intertextual Approach of This Project.”
pride in her great wisdom and excessive wealth. The brief oracle in Amos announces the divine judgment on Tyre for her involvement in slave trade and her violation of brotherhood treaty. In Joel, Tyre is accused of plundering the Judean assets and selling the Judean as slaves. With the image of Tyre being destroyed by fire (Zech 9:4b), Smith argues that “the judgment on Tyre (v. 4) almost certainly is influenced by Amos 1:10.” Though in Amos 1:10 Yahweh threatens to send fire upon the wall of Tyre: , the oracle in Ezekiel has closer verbal similarities. Besides , the punishment of having Tyre being consumed by fire ( ) is also attested in Ezek 28:18.

Many scholars have recognized the connection between Zech 9:2b–4 and Ezek 26–28, particularly 28:2–5, where , and are attested as catchwords. Despite the striking similarities, Petersen casts doubt on this allusion, contending that “one important motif in the Ezekiel Tyrian material, Tyre’s pride, is absent from vv. 3–4, whereas the basic point of Zechariah 9 involves the demise of a major Phoenician port for no apparent reason.” The observation of Petersen is right, however, the word does not appear in Ezek 26–28 where the

---

83 See discussion below.
84 Stuart, Hosea-Jonah, 312; Sweeney, Twelve Prophets 2, 208–209. The distinctive vocabularies shared with Zech 9:2–4 are: , , .
86 Smith, Micah-Malachi, 253.
88 Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 49.
image of Tyre’s pride is inferred by the description of the city. We argue that the intertextual parallel to Ezekiel intends to bring this important motif into conversation in the schema, as we shall discuss.

**Ezekiel 28:2-5**

2 “Son of man, say to the leader of Tyre, ‘Thus says the Lord God,
   “Because your heart is lifted up
   And you have said, ‘I am a god,
   I sit in the seat of gods
   In the heart of the seas’;
   Yet you are a man and not God,
   Although you make your heart like the heart of God—

3 Behold, you are wiser than Daniel;
   There is no secret that is a match for you.

4 “By your wisdom and understanding
   You have acquired riches for yourself
   And have acquired gold and silver for your treasuries.

5 “By your great wisdom, by your trade
   You have increased your riches
   And your heart is lifted up because of your riches.

The two texts demonstrate strong verbal and thematic parallels. In both passages, Tyre is depicted as very wise: הָיוֹת in Zech 9:2b and הָיוֹת in Ezek 28:3 (cf. Ezek 28:4–5). In Zechariah, Tyre piled up numerous חֲסָרָה and גֶּזֶרֶת (Zech 9:3), which she also acquired in Ezekiel (instead of the more common word בָּשַׂם is used for gold in Ezek 28:4). The riches of Tyre are depicted as her לִי in Zech 9:4 and Ezek 28:4–5. In addition, within the larger literary context of the Ezekielian passage, there are two more correspondences. Both texts depict the divine punishment of Tyre as (1) a destruction by fire: הַאֲזֵה in Zech 9:4 and הַאֲזֵה in Ezek 28:18; and
(2) having Tyre’s wealth/rubble being thrown into a watercourse: הָעָדָה בִּישׁ הָרָעָה in Zech 9:4 and הָעָדָה בִּישׁ הָרָעָה in Ezek 26:12. In view of these resemblances, we register Ezek 28:2–5 as an intertext of Zech 9:2b–4.

**Allusion to Ezek 28:2–5.** The oracle against Tyre can be divided into two major sections: (1) the prophecies against Tyre (Ezek 26:1–21); and (2) the judgment against Tyre’s king (Ezek 28:1–10), each followed by a lament, namely, 27:1–36 and 28:11–19 respectively. In the first section, Tyre is punished due to her mockery at the fall of Jerusalem (26:2), a reason linking the Tyre material with the tragedy of Israel. In the second section, the pride of the maritime giant will be brought down despite its remarkable wisdom and excessive wealth (28:2b–5).

The echoing and evoking of the oracle of Ezekiel against Tyre raises the question as to why the redactor is here using the material. After defining the intertext, Nurmela concludes that the similarities between Zech 9:2b–4 and Ezek 28:3–5 are “not very significant” with the reason that allusions to earlier prophets are typical of Second Zechariah. However, we do not agree with Nurmela’s view on the nature of textual relationship. Mason guesses that probably the king of Tyre personifies the whole “spirit of proud independence, of confidence in the powers of her own wisdom and wealth, her strength and all alliances,” thus the traditional material is reused as a
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92 See “2.3.3 The Nature of Textual Relationships.”
warning to the inappropriate leadership within Israel.\textsuperscript{93} Mason’s observation, though hypothetical, is still possible, particularly when we consider the language of the subsequent lament (28:11–19). Zimmerli states that the fate of the king of Tyre “is narrated in terms of primeval man...this prevents the reader...from an overhasty withdrawal of himself from this event. In the pride and fall of the Prince of Tyre, there is repeated the story of ‘primeval man.’ This is ‘Everyman’s story’.”\textsuperscript{94} If the representation of Tyre in the Ezekielian material is typical rather than historical, then the intertextual insights might provoke the readers to ascribe an image of “pride” to the Zecharian Tyre based on the impressive portrayal of the city in the antecedent text. Hence, one of the functions of this allusion to Ezekiel 26–28 is to rebuke all pride of humanity, setting the stage for the audience to dialogue with the subsequent material—the Philistine group (Zech 9:5–7).

However, the intertextual impact may be highlighted if we examine the strategic place of the prophecy against Tyre in Ezekiel. The oracle against Tyre (Ezek 26–28) is part of the collection of oracles against the nations in chapters 25–32, which lies between the judgment on Israel (Ezek 1–24) and the restoration of the people (Ezek 34–48). The function of the collection (Ezek 25–32) is to give historical events a “Yahweh-focused theological interpretation.”\textsuperscript{95} The Ezekielian oracles against the nations not only affirm the sovereignty of Yahweh over all human


\textsuperscript{94} Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 95.

\textsuperscript{95} Renz, Rhetorical Function, 93.
affairs but also signal the turn of fortune of Yahweh’s people.\textsuperscript{96} The judgment against Tyre prepares the ground for what is anticipated in 28:25–26, a passage at the heart of the whole collection, where Yahweh promises: “They will live in it [the land] securely, and they will build houses, plant vineyards and live securely when \textit{I execute judgments} upon all who scorn them round about them” (28:26; italic mine).\textsuperscript{97}

When we examine the two passages in detail, we discover that the redactor of Zech 9–14 deviates from the source text by altering the executor of the judgment from Babylon (Ezek 26:7, 12; cf. 28:7) to Yahweh himself (Zech 9:4) through the change of the first person speech in Ezekiel to third person announcement in Zechariah. By doing so, the act of punishment will be placed into the hand of the Lord, emphasizing the deity’s direct involvement in the execution of judgment (cf. 28:26). This innovative variation assures the actualization of Yahweh’s promise in 28:25–26. The Tyre material asserts that Yahweh’s purposes on earth will be worked out inexorably; even the impregnable stronghold could not stand in his way.

The intertextual reading of the text stresses that the sovereign Yahweh is the author of all the human affairs, including the fate of Israel as well as those of the nations (cf. Zech 9:1c). While the previous oracle (Zech 9:1b–2a) heightens the hope for restoration within the prophetic community, the present oracle (Zech 9:2b–4) reinforces it—Yahweh will remove all obstacles by

\textsuperscript{96} Vawter and Hoppe, \textit{Ezekiel}, 119.
\textsuperscript{97} Renz, \textit{Rhetorical Function}, 94.
himself. However, alongside with this core message, the intertextual backdrop also alerts the readers to re-examine themselves in light of the fate of Tyre, preparing the audience for the next oracle (Zech 9:5–7).

4.3.3 The Philistine Group (Zech 9:5–7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:5–7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a Ashkelon will see and fear,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza will writhe with grief,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also Ekron, for her hope came to ruin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b Then the king from Gaza will perish,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Ashkelon will not be inhabited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a and a mongrel [race] will dwell in Ashdod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b Now I will cut off the pride of the Philistines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a and I will take away his bloodshed violence from his mouth,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and his detested things from among his teeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b Then he will be remained, even he, belonging to our God,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Ekron, like a Jebusite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Phoenicia, Philistia is one of the major geographical areas which formed part of “the land that yet remains” to be captured by the Israelites (Josh 13:2–3). The Philistine cities are in territory allotted to Judah and Dan (Josh 15:45–47; 19:43). As Dan was unable to acquire Ekron, 98 The word יָשַׁ֥בוְ can also be translated as “and he will rule.” Thus, the rendering would be “Then a bastard will rule in Ashdod.” However, this does not affect the interpretation of the verse, i.e., the destruction is very serious (see discussion below).
99 The repetition (four times in six words) of the ה (consonantal suffix “his”) in Zech 9:7a functions to anticipate the emphatic “he” (אֲנָפָמוּ) in the next line. As these consonantal suffix link to the Philistines, thus those remained refer to the remnants of the Philistines; See Woodcock, “Forms and Functions,”112–13. Meyers and Meyers share similar interpretation: “The leadership of the Philistines will be destroyed, yet here the singular Niphal of שָׁר refers to the survival of one individual Philistine leader”; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 115.
she was forced to move to the north and left Judah to contend with the Philistines about the occupation of Ekron (Judg 1:18–19).

The Philistines dominated the Palestinian seacoast in the twelfth and eleventh centuries with their centre of power being a Pentapolis comprising Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, and Ekron (cf. Josh 13:2–3). They had a reputation for being a strong military force with formidable fighters and iron weapons (1 Sam 13:19–21). In the Israelite history, the Philistines constantly posed grave threats to the chosen people, especially in the time of the Judges, as seen in the tales of the migration of the tribe of Dan who travelled North in their search for a safe refuge (Judg 18:1). It was in the time of David that the Philistines were being defeated, putting an end to the Pentapolis (2 Sam 5:17–25; 21:15–22). Many of these cities were either subdued or destroyed in the Assyrian and Babylonian periods.

Ashkelon lies directly on the sea coast, in a strategic location on the Via Maris. She was an important Canaanite city long before becoming a part of Philistia and was the leading maritime power during the twelfth to tenth centuries. Though being destroyed by the Babylonians,

---

100 The noun פיליסטין appears 288 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which 17 time occurs in the prophetic literature: Isa 2:6; 9:11; 11:14; Jer 25:20; 47:1, 4 (x2); Ezek 16:27, 57; 25:15, 16; Amos 1:8; 6:2; 9:7; Obad 1:19; Zeph 2:5; Zech 9:6.
102 The place name אֲשֶׁרķל appears 12 times in the Hebrew Bible: Judg 1:18; 14:19; 1 Sam 6:17; 2 Sam 1:20; Jer 25:20; 47:5, 7; Amos 1:8; Zeph 2:4, 7; Zech 9:5 (x2).
Ashkelon once more became a flourishing seaport under the nominal control of Tyre during the Persian period.\textsuperscript{103}

Gaza\textsuperscript{104} was a regional centre on the southernmost part on the Palestinian coast, with fertile lands and rich wells of sweet waters. She lies on the main highway between Africa and Asia, known as “the way of the land of the Philistines” in the Bible (Exod 13:17). During the rule of Darius, Gaza became a strong fortress town for the Persians, assisting in the crush of the Egyptian rebellions.\textsuperscript{105}

Ekron\textsuperscript{106} is the northernmost of the Philistine group, situated on the west edge of the inner Coastal Plain, the natural and historical frontier zone that separated Philistia and Judah. She marks the southern boundary of Dan (Josh 19:43) and defines the northern border of Judah (Josh 15:11). After being destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in 603 B.C., she is not mentioned in any source until the Hellenistic period. The excavations of Ekron indicate that the city was abandoned until a small Roman settlement was built on the northern edge of the site.\textsuperscript{107}


\textsuperscript{104} The place name \textit{hZ”} appears 20 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 10:19; Deut 2:23; Josh 10:41; 11:22; 15:47; Judg 1:18; 6:4; 16:1, 21; 1 Sam 6:17; 1 Kgs 5:4; 2 Kgs 18:8; Jer 25:20; 47:1, 5; Amos 1:6, 7; Zeph 2:4; Zech 9:5 (x2).

\textsuperscript{105} Katzenstein, “Gaza,” 912–15.

\textsuperscript{106} The place name \textit{!Arq.} appears 22 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 13:3; 15:11, 45, 46; 19:43; Judg 1:18; 1 Sam 5:10 (x2); 6:16, 17; 7:14; 17:52 (x2); 2 Kgs 1:2, 3, 6, 16; Jer 25:20; Amos 1:8; Zeph 2:4; Zech 9:5, 7.

\textsuperscript{107} We do not have much information about Ekron following her destruction by Nebuchadnezzar in 603 B.C. She reappears only in 1 Macc 10:89, in the \textit{Antiquities} of Josephus, and in the work of Eusebius; Laughlin, \textit{Fifty Major Cities}, 111–14. Cf. Dothan, “Ekron,” 415–22.
Ashdod\textsuperscript{108} is a major urban centre, lying also on the Via Maris. She perhaps even surpasses Ashkelon in importance by the late premonarchic period as it was to Ashdod that the ark was transported after it was captured at Ebenezer (1 Sam 5:1–7). The city was first destroyed by Sargon II and then became a Babylonian province after Nebuchadnezzar’s conquest. The excavations of Ashdod indicate that a Persian occupation is well-represented there, with the city probably serving as an administrative centre.\textsuperscript{109}

In Zech 9:5–7, only four of the five cities of the Philistine league are mentioned, missing Gath\textsuperscript{110} which is also not named in other oracles against the Philistines: Jer 25:20, 47:1–7; Ezek 25:15–17; Amos 1:6–8, and Zeph 2:4–7 (see table below). The lack of mention of Gath might be due to the fact that the Philistine Pentapolis had become a Tetrapolis with Gath being included in Israel (2 Chron 11:5–12) or the city had a close relationship with David (1 Sam 27:1–28:2 cf. 2 Sam 6:10–11; 15:18–23).\textsuperscript{111}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philiptines Ashkelon Gaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistines Gaza Ashkelon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistines Gaza Ashkelon Ashdod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaza Ashkelon Ashdod Ekron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{108} The place name יָדָד appears 17 times in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 11:22; 15:46, 47; 1 Sam 5:1, 5, 6, 7; 6:17; 2 Chr 26:6 (x2); Isa 20:1 (x2); Jer 25:20; Amos 1:8; 3:9; Zeph 2:4; Zech 9:6.

\textsuperscript{109} During the Persian period, Ashdod is only mentioned in a few sources, such as Neh 4:1–2, Jdt 2:28; Laughlin, Fifty Major Cities, 33–36. Cf. Dothan, “Ashdod,” 477–82.

\textsuperscript{110} The place name גַּת appears 33 in the Hebrew Bible: Josh 11:22; 1 Sam 5:8; 6:17; 7:14; 17:4, 23, 52; 21:11, 13; 27:2, 3, 4, 11; 2 Sam 1:20; 15:18; 21:20, 22; 1 Kgs 2:39 (x2), 40 (x2), 41; 2 Kgs 12:18; 1 Chr 7:21; 8:13; 18:1; 20:6, 8; 2 Chr 11:8; 26:6; Ps 56:1; Amos 6:2; Mic 1:10.

For the threat of judgment against the Philistines (Zech 9:5–7), echoes of earlier prophetic materials might be found. Person argues that Zech 9:5–6 is influenced by Jer 25:20, he argues:

“The choice of the four Philistine cities and the order in which they are given suggests the influence of Jer 25:20. Of all the possible groupings of Philistine cities, only Jer 25:20 and Zech 9:5–6 have the following sequence of these four Philistine cities: Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron, Ashdod.”112 However, the order of the city-names in Zech 9:5–6 should be Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron, Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ashdod.

On the other hand, Mason suggests an allusion to Amos 1:7–8 as the same four cities are mentioned with similar punishments: “So I will send fire upon the wall of Gaza and it will consume her citadels. I will also cut off (אֶתְכְּפָה) the inhabitant (אִישָּׁה) from Ashdod, and him who holds the scepter, from Ashkelon; I will even unleash My power upon Ekron, and the remnant of

---

the Philistines (שאירה פלשתיה) will perish."

Besides the four city names, both אבב and
כבה are used in Amos 1:7–8 as catchwords, though with different subjects: אבב and כבה in Zech 9:5–6 but אבב and כבה פלשתיה in Amos 1:8. The remnant of the Philistines is also depicted, but with different fates: כבה in
Zech 9:7 but אבב פלשתיה in Amos 1:8.

However, similar judgment oracle against these four cities appears also in Zeph 2:4–7
where not onlyshake, אבב, andכבה occur as linkage. Another oracle against the
Philistines, without naming the four cities, is attested in Ezek 25:15–17, where similar verbal
connections can also be evidenced: שלשה, אבב, andכבה, פלשתיה, שאלת, andכבה פלשתיה, all appearing in the same verse:

“Therefore thus says the Lord God, “Behold, I will stretch out My hand against the Philistines
(שלשה), even cut off (הואברת) the Cherethites and destroy (הואברת) the remnant of the seacoast
(אשם)" (Ezek 25:16). The same phenomenon can be found in Jer 47:1–7 where similar
vocabularies (שפתי, שאלת, כבה) are used in the oracle against Philistines. It seems that these lexical
resemblances reflect a conventional biblical parlan ce, or at least language typical of judgment
oracles against Philistines. In view of this, we are reticent to register Amos 1:7–8 as an intertext
of Zech 9:5–7.114

114 Nurmela arrives at similar conclusion: “an allusion to Am cannot be registered in Ze at this point”; Nurmela, Prophets in Dialogue, 182.
In Zech 9:5a, the oracle against the Philistines starts with an abrupt scene, depicting the tremendous fear of the cities. It is probably the tragedy of Tyre in v. 4 has provoked this agitation. The demise of the Phoenician city signals that their hope is dashed: יִרְדְּבֹתְּךָ נְכָפֵשׁ (Zech 9:5). The noun נְכָפֵשׁ usually has a positive connotation, regarding something with expectation. Apart from here, נְכָפֵשׁ appears only in Isa 20:5–6, where it denotes the vain hope of the Ashdodites who expected that their allies, the Egyptians or Ethiopians, would deliver them from the advancing armies of the Assyrians: “Then they will be dismayed and ashamed (נַעֲבֹד) because of Cush their hope (נְכָפֵשׁ) and Egypt their boast” (20:5; cf. 20:1–6). A similar situation might exist here in which the Philistine cities would expect Tyre, the prominent power of Phoenicia, to rescue them from the approaching divine warrior, Yahweh. Though the source of Ekron’s expectation of help is not directly specified, the close political tie between Ashkelon and Tyre may suggest that the Philistine cities would expect aids from this maritime stronghold.115

Ashkelon and Gaza will be horrified by the storming events in Phoenicia: יִרְדְּבֹתְּךָ נְכָפֵשׁ אֲדֹנָי (Zech 9:5a). Apart from here, the Qal forms of הצָּרִים, ואִם, and לֹא מְהֵרָיִם appear only in Jer

---

115 The inscription of Eshmunazor II (KAI 14), dated to the last quarter of the sixth century B.C or the first half of the fifth century B.C., mentions that the Persian king gave some Palestinian coastal cities to Sidon/Tyre. Thus the Philistian cities might become colonies of the Phoenician powers; Jigoulov, Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia, 50–56. See discussion about Ashkelon above.
5:20–25 where Judah is condemned. Due to the exclusive shared vocabularies, we register Jer 5:20–25 as an intertext of Zech 9:5.\textsuperscript{116}

**Jeremiah 5:20-25**

20 “Declare this in the house of Jacob and proclaim it in Judah, saying,
21 ‘Now hear this, O foolish and senseless people, who have eyes but do not see (אַיַּר); who have ears but do not hear.
22 ‘Do you not fear Me (אַיַּר)?’ declares the LORD. ‘Do you not tremble (שָׁמַע) in My presence? For I have placed the sand as a boundary for the sea, an eternal decree, so it cannot cross over it. Though the waves toss, yet they cannot prevail; though they roar, yet they cannot cross over it.
23 ‘But this people has a stubborn and rebellious heart; they have turned aside and departed.
24 ‘They do not say in their heart, “Let us now fear (שָׁמַע) the LORD our God, who gives rain in its season, both the autumn rain and the spring rain, who keeps for us the appointed weeks of the harvest.”
25 ‘Your iniquities have turned these away, and your sins have withheld good from you.

**Allusion to Jer 5:20–25.** The oracle begins with a summons, inviting God’s people to hear the divine word (v. 20–21). These people are foolish and heartless as they have heard Yahweh’s voice and seen the deity’s work but fail to perceive the divine power in creation (v. 21)—the taming of chaos (v. 22) and the governance of the rain (v. 24). The consequence of this ignorance is the lack of corresponding reverence to the Lord (v. 22, 24). The stubbornness of Israel has turned them away from God (v. 23). The iniquities of the people have deprived them of Yahweh’s provision (vv. 24–25).

\textsuperscript{116} Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 26–30.
The divine questions in verse 22 are rhetorical ones, denouncing the Israelites who see (ראים) Yahweh’s greatness but neither fear (שאדים) nor tremble (עהת) before the sovereign Lord. The failure of the community leads to an inevitable judgment. Jeremiah 5 ends with an ominous question: “What will you do at the end of it [the land]” (ל老鼠 ולתיר, v. 31)?

Obviously, the passage intends to alert the community to learn a lesson before the end—to see and fear, so that a new future is possible.

When we compare Zech 9:5 with its source, we notice that the alluding text has revised the alluded one: (1) the subject of the verbs changes from the Israelites to the Philistines; and (2) the rhetoric of the text shifts from condemning Yahweh’s people who see but not fear to depicting the aliens who see and fear. The Philistines not only see the fall of Tyre but also fear the might of Yahweh. The innovative variation creates a sharp contrast between the two peoples, preparing the readers to understand the surprising twist of the oracle—the remnant of the Philistines (9:7b). The see and fear of the foreign people enables them to have a possible future.

In Zech 9:5b, the destruction of the Philistine cities begins. Gaza will lose her king and Ashkelon will be uninhabited. The clause נזר in Zech 9:6a offers a sense that the

---

117 The expression “at her end” (ל老鼠 ולתיר) in Jer 5:31 is ambiguous. Holladay suggests that the feminine possessive suffix refers to “the land” in v. 30, which is feminine; Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 201.

118 Holladay, Jeremiah 1, 201; Craigie et al., Jeremiah 1-25, 93–96; Brueggemann, Jeremiah 1–25, 64–65; Allen, Jeremiah, 78–81.
destruction of the Ashdodites is so tremendous that הרזע can find room to live in the city without any objection. The outcast, הרזע, becomes part of the inhabitants of Philistia. Though the devastation is overwhelming, to the readers’ surprise, this severe judgment of Yahweh intends to create a remnant for the Lord (Zech 9:7b–c). This concept is radical in that it not only reverses the adverse fate of the remnant of the Philistines announced in all the prophetic literature (Jer 25:20; 47:4–5; Ezek 25:16; Amos 1:8) but also admits the forbidden הרזע, who dwells in Ashdod, into the new commonwealth as this mongrel race is part of the remnant of the Philistines.

In Zech 9:7c, two similes are used to express this unprecedented tone about the remnant of the Philistines: (1) "WhyBi @Lua; and (2) ysiWbyKi !Arq.. These similes further astonish the audience by portraying how the resultant remnant will be integrated into the Judahite community. The first simile depicts that the remnant will be like a @WLa; in Judah. There are different views on the word @WLa.. On the one hand, Mason sees the term as referring to “intimate” or “tamed,” i.e., the remnant of the Philistines will “become the intimates of God’s people.” On the other hand, Mitchell claims that this word appearing in the Zecharian texts (Zech 9:7c; 12:5–6) has a collective sense and clearly refers to a group or social unit, thus rendered as clan. Gottwald

119 The meaning of the Hebrew word הרזע is uncertain. By referencing to Deut 23:4 [3]), most translators render it as “illegitimate birth” (NAU), “illicit union” (NRS), or “half-breed” (NJB). It probably derives from the root רזע, connoting “be bad” or “corrupt”; HALOT, 595; BDB, 561. Cf. Christensen, Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12, 536; Nelson, Deuteronomy, 275.
121 Mitchell was among the earliest exegetes to offer such a view; Mitchell, et al., Critical and Exegetical Commentary, 269. This view is followed by a number of scholars, such as, Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 116;
supports the latter view, contending that יָרִיב, as a social unit, is most appropriate in an archaizing poetic context of Zech 9:7. However, Wenham opposes to the rendering of יָרִיב as clan: “Though this translation is contextually possible, the fact that a similar term ulp is found with the meaning ‘leader’ at Ugarit…and its consistent translation by the versions as ‘leader’ make this interpretation unlikely.” Instead, he proposes to render יָרִיב as “chief.” Since all its 60 occurrences relate to Edom, Wenham argues that יָרִיב is “an Edomite term.” In view of this, we render יָרִיב as “tribal chief,” bearing in mind its relationship with Edom. With this connotation, the first simile projects an image that an alien remnant will be accepted with honour, like an Edomite tribal chief, among the Judahites. The second simile alludes to the Jebusites, with Ekron as the representative of the alien cities. Though the Jebusites were destined for destruction (cf. Exod 23:23), they were later absorbed into Israel after David established his capital in Jerusalem (2 Sam 5:6–10). Just as the Jebusites have a place within Yahweh’s people, so too the remnant will be incorporated into the restored community in the new age.

Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 52; Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 113.
122 Gottwald, Tribes of Yahweh, 277–78.
123 Wenham, Genesis 16-50, 338.
124 Wenham, Genesis 16-50, 338.
125 The noun יָרִיב appears 60 times in the Hebrew Bible. Besides the Zecharian texts (9:7; 12:5, 6), the other appearances of the word יָרִיב with the meaning of “tribal chief” include Gen 36:15 (x5), 16 (x4), 17 (x5), 18 (x4), 19, 21, 29 (x5), 30 (x5), 40 (x4), 41 (x3), 42 (x3), 43 (x3); Exod 15:15; 1 Chr 1:51 (x4), 52 (x3), 53 (x3), 54 (x3). All these occurrences relate to Edom.
126 Wenham, Genesis 16-50, 338.
In order to assist the readers to digest the radical notion of accepting the alien remnant into their new commonwealth (Zech 9:7b–c), the poet recalls for the audience the word \(\text{rzEm.m} \) (9:6a). The noun \(\text{rzEm.m} \) is a rare word. Apart from here, it only appears in Deut 23:3 [23:2], a verse within a larger context (23:3–9 [23:2–8]) where certain kinds of people are prohibited from joining the assembly of Yahweh. Based on the exclusive lexical parallel as well as the similar concern about the admission of the alien people into the community, we register Deut 23:3 [23:2] as an intertext of Zech 9:6a, 7b–c.\(^{127}\)

**Deuteronomy 23:2-8 (NASB95) [MT 23:3–9]**

2  “No one of illegitimate birth (\(\text{rzEm.m} \)) shall enter the assembly of the LORD; none of his descendants, even to the tenth generation, shall enter the assembly of the LORD.

3  “No Ammonite or Moabite shall enter the assembly of the LORD; none of their descendants, even to the tenth generation, shall ever enter the assembly of the LORD,

4–6  because…

7  “You shall not detest an Edomite, for he is your brother; you shall not detest an Egyptian, because you were an alien in his land.

8  “The sons of the third generation who are born to them may enter the assembly of the LORD.

**Allusion to Deut 23:3 [23:2].** Deuteronomy 23:3–9 [23:2–8] lays down the laws about the admission to the assembly of Yahweh (\(\text{hw"hy>-lh;q.} \)).\(^{128}\) Nelson argues that the \(\text{hw"hy>-lh;q.} \) in Deuteronomy refers not only to the corporate worship as it “has been generalized into a synonym for the national community as a whole.”\(^{129}\) The rationale behind this restriction in Deut 23:2–9

---


\(^{128}\) The construct chain \(\text{hw"hy>-lh;q.} \) appears 10 times in the Hebrew Bible: Num 16:3; 20:4; Deut 23:2 [23:1], 3 [2] (x2), 4 [3] (x2), 9 [8]; 1 Chr 28:8; Mic 2:5.

\(^{129}\) Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, 278. This argument is reasonable as \(\text{hw"hy>-lh;q.} \) is nuanced as “all Israel” in 1 Chr 28:8
[23:1–8] might suggest that “only those who are perfect physically and not the product of some unnatural union should be members of the covenant community in ancient Israel.”

The groups of people prohibited from entering the פִּנְחָס in Deut 23:3–9 [23:2–8] are: (1) the emasculated (v. 2 [1]); (2) the illegitimate birth (יֵלֶדִי) (v. 3 [2]); (3) the Ammonites and the Moabites (vv. 3–7 [2–6]); and (4) the Edomites and the Egyptian (vv. 8–9 [7–8]). All of them are not allowed to join the פִּנְחָס forever, except the last group of people, whose children of the third generation are qualify for inclusion (v. 9 [8]). The Edomites deserves a better treatment for their kinship with Israel (וּלָּקַח בְּאִישׁ, v. 8[7]), a view stemming from the story of Esau and Jacob in Gen 25:21–26. Bartlett argues that the “Esau-Edom identification is well established by the fifth century B.C.”

It is important that membership of the פִּנְחָס is not restricted to the

---

130 Christensen, Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12, 537.
131 Edom is a nation lying on the South and East of the Dead Sea, with the King’s Highway passing through the eastern part of her territory (Num 20:17). The Edomites are represented in the Hebrew Bible as the descendants of Esau, the brother of Jacob (Gen 25:19–34; 27:27–29, 39–40; 36:1, 8, 9, 19, 43; Num 20:14–21; Deut 2:4, 8 23:8; Amos 1:11; Obad 10, 12; Mal 1:2–4; cf. 1 Chr 1:34–54). Bartlett dates Malachi to the early/mid-fifth century B.C., between Haggai/Zechariah and Ezra/Nehemiah. By referencing to Mal 1:2–5, he states that the “Esau-Edom identification is well established by the fifth century B.C.”; Bartlett, “Brotherhood of Edom,” 2.

In the United Kingdom, Saul successfully fought against the Edomites (1 Sam 14:47) and David subdued them as his servants (2 Sam 8:14). The subjection of Edom continued until she successfully revolted against the rule of Judah in the time of Jehoram (2 Kgs 8:20). There was continuing hostility of Edom towards Judah and the former was frequently rebuked in the prophet texts for taking vengeance on the latter despite of their brotherly connection (Amos 1:11; Obad 1:12; cf. Joel 3:19; Ezek 25:12–14, 35:15). Edom became the vassal of Assyria, Babylon, and later Persia, with insignificant occupation. By the mid-fifth century B.C., Edom might have been ruined as stated in Mal 1:2–5. Bartlett states: “Edom had ceased to count for anything, as is shown by the absence of any reference to her in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. There is no certain evidence that the Persians took much thought for this mountainous region on the desert fringes of the Trans-Euphrates satrapy.” Bartlett, Edom and the Edomites, 174; Bartlett, “Rise and Fall,” 36–37. Myers suggests that Edom probably fell into Arab hands in the mid-fifth century B.C.; Myers, “Edom and Judah,”836. However, Bartlett argues against Myers’ thesis; Bartlett, Edom and the Edomites, 161. Cf. Bartlett, “Edom,” 287–301.
Israelites alone, but also is open to other people, particularly the Edomites who is regarded as the brother of the Israelites.\(^\text{132}\)

The catchword רֶם обрат is used in different ways in both texts. In Deut 23, רֶם обрат is one of the outcasts excluded forever from the assembly of Yahweh whereas in Zech 9, רֶם обрат is finally absorbed into the new community after being refined (Zech 9:6b–7a).\(^\text{133}\) The host text leverages the earlier congregational act but reverses it in order to garner a new perspective for the audience—to admit the alien residents. In what manner would this previously prohibited people be integrated into the prophetic community? They should be accepted in a most inclusive way, הבשרא and הבשרא (Zech 9:7c). The noun אָלָם, as an Edomite term, recalls for the readers the legislation about the Edomites in Deut 23:8 [23:7] where these people are treated with favor based on brotherhood. The intertextual backdrop asserts that the remnants, even though they are gentiles,\(^\text{134}\) just like the Edomites, who were once excluded from the assembly of Yahweh, are now accepted in the most respective way, as a tribal leader as well as a brother within Judah.\(^\text{135}\)

The juxtaposition of two contradictory ideas, of the alluding and the alluded, intends to create an impact, impelling the readers to embrace a more inclusive attitude. What is the purpose

\(^\text{132}\) McConville, Deuteronomy, 353.

\(^\text{133}\) The refinement process will be discussed below.

\(^\text{134}\) None of the Philistine cities mentioned in Zech 9:5–7 appear in the lists of Ezra-Nehemiah as cities in which Judeans dwelled. Thus, we may infer that Philistia was truly foreign in the mid-fifth century B.C. (cf. Neh 13:23–24).

\(^\text{135}\) This connection is also noted in the work of Tai; Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 30–32.
of nurturing this kind of attitude? There are two possible reasons: (1) to prepare the audience to inherit the land as promised in Ezek 47:13–20, an intertext of Zech 9:1b–2a, where a radical command concerning the inheritance for the resident aliens is followed (47:21–23): “You shall divide it [the land] by lot for an inheritance among yourselves and among the aliens who stay in your midst, who bring forth sons in your midst. And they shall be to you as the native-born among the sons of Israel; they shall be allotted an inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel” (v. 22); and (2) to prepare the audience to accept unreservedly their scattered brothers, the northern exiles, so that they will participate wholeheartedly into their deliverance in order to restore the twelve tribes of Israel. These two proposals satisfy the last two conditions of inheriting the promised land.

The creation of the remnant of the Philistines is possible only after the refinement of Yahweh (9:6b–7a). The see-and-fear of the aliens (Zech 9:5a) alters the nature of Yahweh’s punishment from act of destruction to act of purification, a concept well developed in Second Zechariah, particularly in 13:7–9.

In Zech 9:6b–7a, the cleansing process involves the removal of three abominations from the Philistines: (1) רַעַת; (2) בָּשָׂם; and (3) נַעֲרָיָת שְׁפָן. The first charge against the Philistines is

---

136 Larkin also discerns this connection but with no further elaboration; Larkin, *Eschatology*, 61.
137 To save the northerners is the core message of the second half of Zech 10. *See Chapter Eight.*
138 *See “4.3.1 Syrian Group.”*
their נָפֶשׁ, which is unusual as Philistia is not accused of arrogance in any prophetic oracles. The noun נָפֶשׁ denoting human pride appears notably in Ezekiel (7:20, 24; 16:49, 56; 24:21; 30:6, 18; 32:12; 33:28). The other charges relate to the words יַעֲנֵיאָּה יַעֲנֵיאָּה and יַעֲנֵיאָּה יַעֲנֵיאָּה. Based on the vocabularies יַעֲנֵיאָּה and יַעֲנֵיאָּה, many scholars link the detestations of the Philistines to cultic defilement and idolatrous practices (cf. Lev 7:21; 17:10–14; 19:26; Deut 12:16, 23; 29:16). The problem of this interpretation is that the word יַעֲנֵיאָּה in the text is in plural form, against that in the Mosaic laws where יַעֲנֵיאָּה, referring to eating blood, is always in singular and never occurs together with the word יַעֲנֵיאָּה. The word יַעֲנֵיאָּה in plural frequently denotes the shedding of blood, such as Gen 4:10–11. The figurative use of the word יַעֲנֵיאָּה in the Hebrew Bible, such as יַעֲנֵיאָּה יַעֲנֵיאָּה הָנֵּה יַעֲנֵיאָּה פַּרְפַּרְפַּרְפַּרְפַּרְפַּרְפַּרְפַּרְפַּרְפַּר ("but the mouth of the wicked conceals violence") in Prov 10:6, supports our argument that God intends to remove the bloodshed violence in 9:7a. The plural יַעֲנֵיאָּה with the meaning of

---

139 The word נָפֶשׁ can have a positive nuance—majesty, excellence, glory (cf. Exod 15:7; Ps 47:5; Isa 2:10). However the נָפֶשׁ in Zech 9:6b connotes a negative sense of arrogance. It may refer to those materials that might cause either pride or arrogance, such as wealth, power. However, the verb הִכְרַתִּי usually indicates the cutting off of real things rather than ideas; thus נָפֶשׁ might be used here in both ways to represent abstract pride or wealth as well as the ruler amassing such aspects of power. Cf. Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 112.

140 The noun נָפֶשׁ appears 49 times in the Hebrew Bible, of which 30 times denoting human arrogance: Lev 26:19; Job 35:12; Ps 59:13; Prov 8:13; 16:18; Isa 13:11, 19; 14:11; 16:6 (x2); 23:9; Jer 13:9 (x2); 48:29 (x2); Ezek 7:20, 24; 16:49, 56; 24:21; 30:6, 18; 32:12; 33:28; Hos 5:5; 7:10; Amos 6:8; Zeph 2:10; Zech 9:6; 10:11.

141 Such as Redditt, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, 113; Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 21; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 113; Boda, Haggai, Zechariah, 413. However, Petersen claims that “explicit language of ritual and purification is not used” in the text; Petersen, Zechariah 9–14, 51.

142 HALOT, 225. BDB explains that the plural דָּמִים has a sense of “abundance, blood in quantity, hence sometimes of blood shed by rude violence”; BDB, 196. The plural of דָּמִים appears 73 times in the Hebrew Bible: Gen 4:10, 11; Exod 4:25, 26; 22:1, 2; Lev 12:4, 5, 7; 20:9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 27; Deut 19:10; 22:8; 1 Sam 25:26, 33; 2 Sam 1:16; 3:28; 16:7, 8 (x2); 21:1; 1 Kgs 2:5, 31, 33, 2 Kgs 9:7 (x2), 26 (x2); 1 Chr 22:8; 28:3; 2 Chr 24:25; Ps 5:7, 9:13; 26:9; 51:16; 55:24; 59:3; 106:38; 139:19; Prov 29:10; Isa 1:15; 4:4; 9:4; 26:21; 33:15; Ezek 7:23; 9:9; 16:6 (x3), 9, 36; 18:13; 22:2; 24:6, 9; Hos 1:4; 4:2 (x2); 12:15; Mic 3:10; 7:2; Nah 3:1; Hab 2:8, 12, 17; Zech 9:7.

143 See other similar use of the word דָּמִים, such as Prov 4:24; 10:11; 11:9; 12:6; 18:7; 26:28.
bloodshed occurs prominently in Ezekiel (cf. 7:23; 9:9; 18:13; 22:2; 24:6, 9). The three abominations of the Philistines mentioned in Zech 9:6b–7a are attested exactly in Ezek 7:20–24. Based on these striking lexical similarities and thematic parallels, we register Ezek 7:20–24 as an intertext of Zech 9:6b–7a, with יָאָר, וְיָר, and יָרָבָר as catchwords.144

Ezekiel 7:20-24
20 ‘They transformed the beauty of His ornaments into pride (יִּשְׂרָאֵל), and they made the images of their abominations and their detestable things (שָׁבָעֲשָׁתָם) with it; therefore I will make it an abhorrent thing to them.
21 ‘I will give it into the hands of the foreigners as plunder and to the wicked of the earth as spoil, and they will profane it.
22 ‘I will also turn my face from them, and they will profane My secret place; then robbers will enter and profane it.
23 ‘Make the chain, for the land is full of bloody crimes (יָרָבָר) and the city is full of violence.
24 ‘Therefore, I will bring the worst of the nations, and they will possess their houses. I will also make the pride of the strong ones (יָאָר יִשְׂרָאֵל) cease, and their holy places will be profaned (שָׁבָעֲשָׁתָם וּלְךָ, יִשְׂרָאֵל).

Allusion to Ezek 7:20–24. Ezekiel 7:20–24 is embedded within Ezek 7 which is the last oracle of judgment against Jerusalem before the departure of the glory of Yahweh in Ezek 10. The chapter expresses a strong sense of despair and a desperate situation of crisis: “An end! The end is coming” (יָרָבָר יִשְׂרָאֵל, 7:2; cf. vv. 3, 6). The יָרָבָר in Ezek 7 is not a warning but a sure extinction.145 It announces the fall of the holy city as a result of the sins of God’s people, with verses 20–24 focusing on the profanation of the temple (7:24).146

144 Tai, Prophetie als Schriftauslegung, 33.
145 Vawter and Hoppe, Ezekiel, 56.
146 Renz, Rhetorical Function, 69; Allen, Ezekiel 1-19, 97–113.
In the Ezekielian text, the primary sin of the Israelites relates to יִרְזָא, appearing in 7:20 as יָרָזָא and 7:24 as יִרְזָא, forming an inclusio around 7:20–24. A glance through the use of the term יִרְזָא in Ezekiel, we realize that the sources of the people’s pride include the temple (24:21), military force (30:6, 18), and economic prosperity (33:28; cf. 7:19). They depended on these worldly materials rather than Yahweh who will surely address the problems. The second sin connects to הֶעֱרָבָן (7:20), a word appearing usually together with abomination (חַשְׂרֶף) in Ezekiel (cf. 5:11; 7:20; 11:18, 21). It relates to the images and idols on which the community relied, thus profaning the holy sanctuary (37:23). The third sin is יַהֲנָה (7:23), thus falling short of God’s expectations on their moral lives. Because the land was full of blood crimes and the city was full of violence, the people of Yahweh had to go into exile.147

The prophet Ezekiel states clearly that, with all these sins, Yahweh’s people cannot inherit the promised land (33:25–26): “Therefore say to them, ‘Thus says the Lord GOD, “You eat meat with the blood in it, lift up your eyes to your idols as you shed blood. Should you then possess the land? You rely on your sword, you commit abominations and each of you defiles his neighbor’s wife. Should you then possess the land?” Despite the fact that these sinful people have to go into exile, the prophet comforts them with a promissory note: “… I [Yahweh] will deliver them from all their dwelling places in which they have sinned, and will cleanse them. And they will be My

people, and I will be their God” (37:23). Ezekiel 37:23 ends with a covenant formula: לִקְרָא יִתֵּן לְךָ אֶלֶה, emphasizing that the purpose of the judgment is to restore the covenantal relationship. Thus, the disaster that the Israelites were going to face was actually a process of refinement, allowed by Yahweh, aiming at creating a remnant with spiritual renewal.

The cleansing process of Yahweh’s people in Ezekiel is used as an analogy to the transformation of the Philistines. Similar to Ezek 7:20–24 where Yahweh has taken action to remove the sins of the Israelites, namely, גָּאוֹן, עָנָי, and מִקְחַת, in order to create a remnant suitable to possess the Land (cf. 33:25–26; 37:23), the Philistines must also be purified as such before they could be admitted into the assembly of Yahweh. Though the refining process will be severe, just like the complete uprooting of the cities as depicted in Zech 9:5–6a, after the purging campaign of Yahweh, a remnant suitable to inherit the ideal homeland will be restored (cf. Ezek 47:21–23). At that time, even Ekron who was so difficult to subdue will be absorbed into the transformed community, like the Jebusites of old, living among the Israelites (Zech 9:7c). Even the outcast מַחָל, like Edom, who had once been excluded from the covenantal blessings will become part of the new community, restoring the brotherhood of humankind (Zech 9:7c).

The typological correspondence established between the host text and the source one could serves as an archetype of Yahweh’s transformation program for humanity, including the prophetic community of Second Zechariah, who must be purified before they could inherit the promised
land (cf. Zech 10:1–3a; 11:1–3, 17; 12:10–13:9). By perceiving the divine refinement through the lens of this typical prophecy in Zech 9:5–7, the readers know that such transformation, though inconceivable, is completely possible in the hands of Yahweh.

At first glance, the Philistine material looks like one of the oracles against the nations in other prophetic literature, as Mason suggests. It projects an impression that the Lord simply intends to remove this traditional enemy so that the prophetic community could possess the land. It is true that, at the surface level, the text does convey this message of salvation. However, the radical twist of the pericope invites the readers to understand the deeper meaning of the passage in light of its intertexts. By recalling, the original perception of the host text is enriched when the audience brings the source to bear on the alluding one. With the intertextual insights, Zech 9:5–7 is both promising and exhortative. The oracle summons the audience to have faithful response to Yahweh’s coming acts in the world. It urges the readers (1) to learn a lesson from the past—to see and fear—which is an important key for the divine transformation; and (2) to nurture an inclusive attitude towards their dispersed brothers—the northern exiles. In view of this, Yahweh’s purpose in this unit is not only to restore the homeland but also to renew the people so that they would be qualify to inherit the land.

---

148 See subsequent discussions.
4.4 The Inauguration of the New Age (Zech 9:8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation of Zechariah 9:8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a Now I encamp at my house as a guard, without anyone who passes through and returns, and no more shall an oppressor traverse against them, 8b for now I have seen with my eyes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last word יִבְשָׂא (Jebusite) in Zech 9:7 connects the readers to Yahweh’s יִבְשָׂא, which is in Jerusalem—the locus of verse 8. The word יִבְשָׂא with Yahweh as subject is frequently used of the temple (cf. 2 Sam 7:5–6; 1 Kgs 7:12; 1 Chr 17:5), though it also refers to the earlier tent of worship on six occasions (Judg 18:31; 19:18; 1 Sam 1:7, 24; 2 Sam 12:20 and 1 Chr 9:23).^150

After capturing the territories, Yahweh marches down to his temple and takes up residence on his throne in Jerusalem (Zech 9:8).^151 The divine return marks the inauguration of the new age, ushering in God’s decisive act of salvation.^152

Zechariah 9:8 represents a picture that Yahweh will return to Zion and encamp as a guard for his temple with the result that Jerusalem will be free from any oppressors. This idea leads some scholars to relate this verse to certain passages in Proto-Zechariah, particularly 1:16–17 and 2:8–9 [2:4–5], where the themes of divine return and divine protection appear.^153 For the latter

---

^150 I do not agree with Mitchell and Tai who argue that יִבְשָׂא should refer to the people of Judah rather than the temple based on the subsequent plural יִבְשָׂא; Tai, Prophétie als Schriftauslegung, 18; Mitchell, et al., Critical and Exegetical Commentary, 269.

^151 Since the temple was built in Jerusalem (see Zech 1:16), therefore it is reasonable to suggest that Yahweh was marching towards Jerusalem. Moreover, from Zech 1:16–17 (“I will return to Jerusalem”) and 8:3 (“I will return to Zion”), we find that the term “Zion” and “Jerusalem” are used interchangeably in Zechariah (also see Zech 9:9).


^153 Similar connections are noted by some scholars, such as, Mason, “Use of Earlier Biblical Material,” 24–25;
passage, since there is no verbal parallel, we are reluctant to register it as an intertext. For the former one, Mason argues for a dependence with יִרְחֵי and יָשָׁשׁ as catchwords: “Therefore thus says the LORD, ‘I will return to Jerusalem with compassion; My house (יְרוּשָׁלָי) will be built in it,’ declares the Lord of hosts, ‘and a measuring line will be stretched over Jerusalem.’ ‘Again (יָשָׁשׁ), proclaim, saying, “Thus says the LORD of hosts, ‘My cities will again (יָשָׁשׁ) overflow with prosperity, and the LORD will again (יָשָׁשׁ) comfort Zion and again (יָשָׁשׁ) choose Jerusalem’” (Zech 1:16–17). However, the destination of the return is different—in Zech 1, Yahweh returns to Jerusalem where the temple will be built whereas in Zech 9, the Lord returns to the temple so that oppressive forces no longer (יָשָׁשׁ) traverse against his people. Besides thematic parallels, the lexical similarities between the two texts are not impressive enough to argue for a literary dependence. In view of this, we do not register Zech 1:16–17 as an intertext of 9:8.

Zechariah 9:8a depicts that the approaching divine warrior will encamp (יִרְחֵי) around his house, as a protective shield guarding against any oppressor. Apart from here, the same verbal form יִרְחֵי appears in the Hebrew Bible exclusively in Isa 29:3, where יָשָׁשׁ is also attested, a hophal participle of יָשָׁשׁ, with יָשָׂשׁprobably as its feminine noun. Both יָשָׁשׁ and יָשָׂשׁ are hapax legomena.

Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 119; Sæbø, Sacharja 9–14, 159.
155 HALOT, 620; BDB, 663; Gesenius and Tregelles, Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, 500; Jansma, Inquiry, 69.
Isaiah 29:3

I will camp (˂חָנִיתִי) against you encircling you, and I will set siegeworks against you, and I will raise up battle towers (˂בָּשָׁמָן) against you.

In the Hebrew Bible, the qal of חָנִיתִי occurs 143 times, basically attested in two meanings: (1) to encamp with non-military sense, such as the encampment of the Israelites during their wilderness journey (cf. Num 1:52); and (2) to encamp with military sense, such as the encampment of a troop during a military expedition (cf. 1 Sam 4:1). Both Zech 9:8 and Isaiah 29:3 belong to the latter group with a warlike setting, but with a different emphasis—Isa 29:3 describes an act against Jerusalem whereas Zech 9:8 depicts the protection of God’s house. Though Ps 34:8 [34:7], which asserts that the angel of the Lord encamps (˂חָנִיתִי) around those who fear Yahweh as a protection against their enemies, has a closer thematic parallel with the Zecharian text, the Isaianic one should be the right candidate due to the impressive similarities: (1) shared vocabularies (˂חָנִיתִי and ˂בָּשָׁמָן vs. ˂חָנִיתִי in Ps 34:8 [34:7]); and (2) the same subject (Yahweh, not the angel of the Lord as in Ps 34:8 [34:7]). Based on these correspondences, we register Isa 29:3 as an intertext of Zech 9:8a.

Allusion to Isaiah 29:3. Isaiah 29:3 is embedded within a pericope (Isa 29:1–8) where Jerusalem’s destiny is announced. The passage is divided into two sections: (1) a divine

---

156 In the Hebrew Bible, the qal of חָנִיתִי appears 143 times, of which 6 times occurs in the prophetic texts: Isa 29:1, 3; Jer 50:29; 52:4; Nah 3:17; Zech 9:8.
157 Based on the exclusive verbal similarity (˂חָנִיתִי), Nurmel concludes that there is a “probable allusion” to Isa 29:3 in Zech 9:8; Nurmel, Prophets in Dialogue, 108–109. Cf. Willi-Plein, Prophetie am Ende, 69; Larkin, Eschatology, 66; Rudolph, Sacharja 9–14, 175.
158 The explanation here references to the following works, unless noted otherwise; Blenkinsopp, Isaiah 1-39,
judgment of Jerusalem (29:1–4) which is followed by (2) a sudden and unanticipated divine deliverance (29:5–8). This depiction corresponds closely with the historical circumstance in which Jerusalem was under siege during the reign of Hezekiah, but experiencing a miraculous relief with the sudden retirement of the Assyrian army in 701 B.C. The pericope asserts that Yahweh is the agent of assault as well as deliverance.

The first section begins with a woe, setting a tone of threat against Jerusalem who relies on her ritual observance rather than Yahweh (v. 1; cf. 1:11–15). The city will be besieged by Yahweh (v. 3) with her people suffering a humiliation as unto death (v. 4). The second section describes the divine deliverance of Jerusalem with Yahweh’s punishment falling on her foes, portrayed in the language of theophany (vv. 5–6). The simile in vv. 7–8 compares the assault of the hostile nations to a dream, asserting that, with Yahweh’s assistance, these threats will be “like a fantasy, as though it had never happened, as though it leaves no enduring effect.”

The Isaianic text is not only recalled but also reversed in order to explicate the essence of the new age. By alluding to Isa 29:3, the Zecharian text opens a new vista for the audience, inviting them to view the advent of Yahweh through the lens of the earlier material. Instead of

---


159 There are different scholarly views on the beginning of the section regarding the deliverance of Jerusalem. For example, Blenkinsopp suggests a start in v. 5, Brueggemann chooses v. 5d, whereas Sweeney opts for v. 7; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 389–402; Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 230–32; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 373–86.

160 Scholars generally ascribe this passage to the Assyrian attack in 701 B.C.; such as, Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 389–402. However, Sweeney opposes to this linkage; Sweeney, *Isaiah 1-39*, 382.

encamping to attack Jerusalem, the Lord comes to protect her inhabitants. With the assistance of Yahweh, God’s people could experience the miraculous salvation of the deity as all oppressive forces will be insubstantial in front of the deity.

In the inauguration of the new epoch, not only is the judgment oracle in Isaiah reversed, but also the desolation scene in Zech 7:14 is revised. The phrase הֵמָּה יָתַשְׁפָּה causes some trouble for scholars. Jansma regards it as redundant whereas Hanson deems it as an explanatory gloss, as does BHS. However, we argue that the obscure construction of Zech 9:8a serves as a marker, pointing the audience to its source. Apart from here, the explanatory phrase הֵמָּה יָתַשְׁפָּה appears in exact verbal form only in Zech 7:14. Based on the exclusive lexical parallel and the awkward construction of the phrase, we register Zech 7:14 as an intertext of Zech 9:8a.

Zechariah 7:14
“but I scattered them with a storm wind among all the nations whom they have not known. Thus the land is desolated behind them so that no one went back and forth (וְאֵלֵב יָתַשְׁפָּה) for they made the pleasant land desolate.”

Allusion to Zech 7:14. Zechariah 1:1–6 and Zech 7–8 are generally regarded as the prose frames of First Zechariah. The closing frame opens with a discussion about fasting (vv. 1–3) which leads to the prophet’s challenge of the intention of observing the ritual (vv. 4–6) and a review of God’s discipline in the past (vv. 7–14). Zechariah 8 begins with a new focus,

---

163 Besides Zech 7:14, the phase יָתַשְׁפָּה in participle absolute also appears in Ezek 35:7, with both texts portraying the desolation of the land after Yahweh’s punishment to Israel and Edom respectively.
164 Meyers and Meyers believe that this is a quotation of Zech 7:14, emphasizing the contrast between the past; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9–14, 119.
portraying Yahweh’s blessings as well as ethical demands in the restoration when the Lord returns to Jerusalem.\(^{165}\)

Because of their disobedience, Yahweh chastised the former generation by scattering them among other nations, resulting in the complete desolation of the land (Zech 7:14). The harsh effects of the destruction of the land is expressed by the phrase בָּמִי יִשְׂרָאֵל, referring to the absence of people crossing back and forth, probably due to: (1) depopulation caused by the exile; (2) reduction of productive activity due to deportation or military devastation; and (3) the absence of travelers owing to general insecurity resulting from the ruin.\(^{166}\)

In both texts, בָּמִי יִשְׂרָאֵל highlights the actions of Yahweh on behalf of his people—the complete desolation in the past (Zech 7:14) and the great protection in the future (Zech 9:8). The source is evoked not only to form a contrast, but also to create an expectation. The position of Zech 7:14 in the closing frame of Zech 1–8 is important as it concludes a section depicting Yahweh’s discipline to the past generation with the oracles of salvation and blessing (Zech 8) following it. The allusion endows the readers with a vision, urging them to envisage the coming restoration in the rest of Second Zechariah.

4.5 Summary (Zech 9:1–8)

4.5.1 Source Text


\(^{166}\) Meyers and Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, 405.
In Zech 9:1–8, seven intertexts are detected (see table below), of which three (no. 1, 2, 5) are recalled from the book of Ezekiel. Among the three Ezekielian antecedents, the text of the ideal boundaries (no. 1) in the great temple vision (Ezek 40–48) serves as the backbone of the Zech 9:1–8. It is evoked as supplement in order to nuance the restoration program of the Zecharian text. In addition, one earlier prohibitions (no. 4) and two judgment oracles (no. 6, 7) are summoned and reversed to signal the inauguration of the new age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Zech 9:1–8</th>
<th>Intertext</th>
<th>Strategy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9:1b–2a</td>
<td>Ezek 47:13–20</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9:2b–4</td>
<td>Ezek 28:2–5</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9:5</td>
<td>Jer 5:20–25</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9:6a, 7b–c</td>
<td>Deut 23:3</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9:6b–7a</td>
<td>Ezek 7:20–24</td>
<td>supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9:8a</td>
<td>Isa 29:3</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9:8a</td>
<td>Zech 7:14</td>
<td>revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* refers to “2.3.3 The Nature of Textual Relationships.”

4.5.2 Intertextual Reading

By leveraging earlier materials, Zech 9:1–8 expresses its visions for restoration. The corpus opens with the advent of Yahweh, marching from north to south in the Levant till he reaches the sacred centre—the temple. The coming of the Lord ushers in prosperity and blessings (Zech 9:16–17), reversing the adverse fortune of the past (Isa 29:3; Zech 7:14). By alluding to Ezek 47, the return of Yahweh represents his territorial claim to kingship, denoting his reign in the restoration era.
The first vision (Zech 9:1b–2a) of the restoration envisions the establishment of an ideal homeland as presented in Ezek 47:13–20. Yahweh will come to conquer the foreign cities, claiming his territories, and preparing the land for his people. The new homeland will enjoy Yahweh’s eye-watching protection (Zech 9:8). The intertextual insights surely heighten the expectation for a new age within the prophetic community.

However, at the beginning of the corpus, Zech 9:1–8 also evokes the conditional nature of the restoration program, insisting the spiritual renewal of the subject people. The geography of the toponyms serves to circumscribe the anticipated homeland as well as to envision the restored Israel who acknowledges Yahweh’s kingship.

Associated with the first vision is the creation of an ideal people, suitable to dwell in the promised homeland with Yahweh in their midst (cf. Ezek 43:1–7). By using the rhetorical marker אַלּוֹ to introduce and structure the oracles, the corpus asserts that the word of Yahweh has revealed once again among the people. By appropriating the Jeremianic material (Jer 5:20–25), the source summons the people to have faithful response to the coming of the Lord. By deviating from the source text (Ezek 28:3–5), the Tyre passage (Zech 9:2b–4) declares that Yahweh’s salvation for his people will be worked out inexorably. However, the intertextual insights also reminds the readers to re-examine themselves in light of Tyre’s fate. By using the cleansing process of the Philistines (Zech 9:5–7) as an archetype, the corpus invites the audience to believe
that Yahweh can transform any situation in favor of the restoration (cf. Ezek 7:20–24). By reversing the earlier prohibition (Deut 23:3), the intertextual reading exhorts the readers to nurture an inclusive attitude towards their dispersed brothers, a requirement set forth in Ezek 47–48.

The ultimate restoration includes the formation of an ideal remnant settling in an ideal homeland, with Yahweh as king. At that time, even those nations who were formerly extra-territorial to Israel will be among those with which peace will be proclaimed (Zech 9:10), recognizing the sovereignty of Yahweh. Even those peoples which had once posed grave threats to Israel will be absorbed into the transformed community, living together in harmony (Zech 9:7çβ). Even those outcasts who had once been excluded from the covenantal blessings will become part of the new community, restoring the brotherhood of humankind (Zech 9:7α; cf. Ezek 47:21–23).